



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,358	04/13/2006	Dominique Bourel	065691- 0433	5572
22428 7590 03/31/2009 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
OUSPENSKI, ILIA I				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1644				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/31/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/566,358

Applicant(s)

BOUREL ET AL.

Examiner

ILIA OUSPENSKI

Art Unit

1644

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/10/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment and remarks filed on 12/10/2008 are acknowledged.

Claims 15 and 17 have been canceled.

Claims 16 and 18 – 24 are pending.

2. The objections and rejections of record have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment and arguments, except as reiterated herein.

It is noted that new grounds of rejection, necessitated by Applicant's amendment are set forth herein.

3. The following is a quotation of the **second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 23 is rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 23 is indefinite as being dependent on a cancelled claim. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the metes and bounds of the claimed invention. It is suggested that Applicant rewrite the claim in independent

form to include the limitations of base claims. Alternatively, the claims may be amended to depend on other base claims currently under consideration.

Applicant is reminded that any amendment must point to a basis in the specification so as not to add new matter. See MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06.

5. The following is a quotation of the **first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 16 and 18 – 24 stand rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, because the specification, while being enabling for methods of treating a specific disease by administering a specific corresponding antibody (such as e.g. B-cell lymphoma and anti-CD20 antibody), does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of treating a disease with an unrelated antibody (such as the great majority of disease/antibody combinations recited e.g. in claims 15 and 23), or a method of treating any disease by administering a generically recited antibody (such as recited e.g. in claim 15). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The rejection is maintained for the reasons of record.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but have not been found convincing.

Applicant argues that the skilled artisan would understand that only the effective combinations of disease/antibody are within the scope of the claims, while the ineffective or harmful combinations are not encompassed by the claims.

This is not found persuasive, because the claims are not limited to those disease/antibody combinations disclosed in the specification. Given the large number of unrelated diseases recited in the claims, and the generic recitation of an antibody of undefined specificity (claim 16) or the large number of recited antibody specificities (claims 23 and 24), the amount of experimentation left to the skilled artisan in determining those combinations which result in "treating" of the recited diseases is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue.

Therefore, the rejection of record is maintained for the reasons of record, as it applies to the amended claims. The rejection of record is incorporated by reference herein, as if reiterated in full.

7. Claims 16 and 18 – 20 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It is maintained that Applicant is not in possession of the claimed methods, because Applicant is not in possession of the generically recited antibody of undefined specificity.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but have not been found convincing.

Applicant argues that the specification discloses sufficient correlation between structure and function of the claimed antibodies in Examples 1 – 4 and Figures 1 – 4, in that the enhanced lysis results from the glycosylation structure recited in claim 16.

While the argument is acknowledged, it is deemed insufficient, because in addition to the ability of the antibody to induce lysis of the target cell, the ability of the antibody to bind to the target cell is equally essential for the claimed methods. Applicant has not provided a sufficient written description to be in possession of the genus of antibodies of unknown specificities that would nonetheless be effective in treating the recited diseases.

Therefore, the rejection of record is maintained for the reasons of record, as it applies to the amended claims. The rejection of record is incorporated by reference herein, as if reiterated in full.

8. The nonstatutory **double patenting** rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 16 and 18 – 24 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type **double patenting** as being unpatentable over claims 1, 12, 28, and 38 of copending Application No. 10/575,333, for the reasons of record.

Applicant's request to hold this rejection in abeyance is acknowledged.

The rejection is maintained, but held in abeyance.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. Conclusion: no claim is allowed.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI whose telephone number is (571)272-2920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen B. O'Hara can be reached on 571-272-0878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ILIA OUSPENSKI/

ILIA OUSPENSKI, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1644

March 27, 2009